

important, far-reaching legislation. What we have been considering, Mr. Speaker, is antiterrorism or counterterrorism legislation.

This legislation which has come before the Committee on the Judiciary is not something that arose simply because of what happened recently in Oklahoma, although it has taken on additional and rather urgent importance in light of what happened in Oklahoma.

It is however of concern to a number of us as conservatives and who were sent here to the House of Representatives as result of the election last year to take a very hard look at the power of the Federal Government to determine not only if there are circumstances under which the powers of the Federal Government may have gotten too broad, too large, and too extended so that we would be looking at methods to bring back in and rein back in the power of the Federal Government in those instances in which it has been too broadly construed or has been extended too far, but also to be very careful and jealous guardians of those authorities that currently belong to States and local communities and to take a very hard look, a very fair look, but a very hard look at those areas where the Federal Government is seeking to expand its authority.

The legislation that we have been considering in the Judiciary Committee raises some of these concerns that I would like to this evening just raise and alert the people of the United States of America to.

None of us favor terrorism, and certainly when we have legislation that is couched as counterterrorism or antiterrorism, certainly there is a predisposition, an inclination on all of our parts to say absolutely, we must pass whatever legislation is necessary in order to do everything within reason and within the bounds of our Constitution to prevent incidents such as what happened in Oklahoma recently from occurring, and to ensure that if it ever does occur, that our law enforcement officials and our prosecutors and our courts have full authority to investigate thoroughly, to apprehend, to prosecute, and then to punish to the greatest extent possible under our system of laws those that would perpetrate such acts on American citizens or indeed anybody within the geographic bounds of the United States of America.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, that we are facing and that I am personally facing in the committee with regard to this legislation, is that it seems to go beyond what the Government needs in order to really carry out its responsibility to protect American citizens against acts of terrorism and to prosecute those who do commit acts of terrorism. It goes beyond what is needed to simply what some of our law enforcement officials and some in our Government would like to see the Federal Government have.

It extends the reach, for example, Mr. Speaker, very broadly beyond the current definition of what is terrorism, and under the legislation that we are currently considering in the Committee on the Judiciary, for example, virtually any crime of violence committed anywhere in our country for whatever reason becomes a terrorist action.

Once under the legislation that is being considered an action becomes or falls within the definition of terrorism or terrorist activity or terrorist action, then a whole series of things occurs such as loosening of the standard on wiretap authority, loosening of the standard on the Federal Government's ability and law enforcement's ability to obtain certain types of records on citizens, and so on and so forth.

This is the concern, Mr. Chairman, and I think we need to be very, very careful and very jealous that in our understandable effort and our understandable zeal to protect our citizens against a recurrence of what happened in Oklahoma that we do not cross over the line and extend too much authority to the Government and that we do not inadvertently trample on some of our very cherished constitutional rights.

□ 1930

We are going to be continuing the markup of this legislation tomorrow. There will be further refinements to it, and then, of course, the full House will have full opportunity to look at this.

But I do have some concerns, Mr. Speaker, with this legislation, in that it does seem to go far beyond the current bounds of the reach of the Federal Government and really gets the Federal Government into a whole range of activities that, under standards of federalism, certainly as I and the citizens of the Seventh District understand them, say, "Yes, we do want to have strong Federal law enforcement, but that does not mean we want the Federal Government involved in virtually every aspect of criminal activity that might take place anywhere in our country."

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having the opportunity to share some of these concerns, and we will hear more on this as we continue the deliberations in the Committee on the Judiciary and on the full floor.

#### TRIBUTE TO RAMSEY CLARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Fox of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise because I was very privileged today to attend, I think, a very significant ceremony in which Ramsey Clark, the former Attorney General in the Kennedy and subsequent administrations, from Texas and our area, served, and I was visited by Maury Maverick, Jr., who then escorted me to the ceremony in the Gold Room today.

And I would like to place in the record the remarks that Maury Maverick made with respect to Ramsey Clark. For instance, he points out that once he was a corporal in the United States Marine Corps. Once he was the Attorney General of the United States. And I was here when he was named Attorney General and had a lot to do with working with him.

And Maury says he reminds him very much of Stephen Crane's Civil War novel, "The Red Badge of Courage."

In any event, I was privileged to have been at this reception earlier this day, and thanks to Maury Maverick, his father, Maury Maverick, Sr., the original Maury Maverick, was one of those that first recognized me, totally unknown, a young student emerging from what we call the west side of San Antonio, the Mexican-American section, which at that time was really, really split and divided, and it was thanks to their magnificent friendship that it aroused in me an interest in political or public work.

So that I am placing that at this point in the RECORD, the remarks that Mr. Maverick prepared honoring Ramsey Clark, as follows:

Regarding so-called anti-terrorist legislation, one must face that threat to liberty and constitutional due process with the courage of a Ramsey Clark.

If what we are about to have is a new McCarthy era then I know something about the terror of the old one. As a member of the Texas House of Representatives of the 1950s I was one of the two legislators who filibustered to death the Texas Un-American Activities Committee. Are we on the road to having such committees again?

A paralysis of fear swept America in the 1950s and it will happen again if judges, congressmen, and the President run out on the Bill of Rights.

The ultimate answer to terrorism is Jeffersonian liberty, three meals a day, and human dignity.

Democrats with the knowledge of history of Franklin Roosevelt and Republicans with a sense of justice of Potter Stewart must stand up to the emerging new McCarthyism.

The bullies are on the move. The courage of Ramsey Clark must be shown by lawyers and politicians if we are not to have a new McCarthy era.

A new McCarthy era will be a worse disgrace than the last one because it will mean we didn't learn anything.

My brother and sister lawyers, friends and fellow citizens, I give you that former corporal in the U.S. Marine Corps and former Attorney General of the United States: Ramsey Clark.

#### WELCOMING THE PRESIDENT TO THE BUDGET BALANCING ARENA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last night President Clinton unveiled his second budget this year. The first budget actually increased deficit spending by \$200 billion each year and grew our national debt from the current \$4.9 trillion up to \$7 trillion in 5 years.

This budget from last night aims to balance the Federal budget in 10 years. Well, we welcome the President to the arena, admitting that we should be balancing this budget. However, 10 years? This means that during the next 10 years, the Federal debt, which is now \$5 trillion, will still be growing. It means that we hope that a decade from now when children who are now in the third grade, they will be graduating from high school, the budget will still not be balanced.

Remember, the President did not say the debt would be paid off. He said that if all goes well, we will stop adding to the debt a decade from now. That does not count what we are borrowing from social security and everything else.

Now, does not this all sound a little ludicrous? Do we really think that Congress will balance the budget 10 years from now, putting it off that long? We just cannot do it today?

There are some of us out there who remember the character Wimpy in the Popeye cartoons. Wimpy made the famous line, "I will gladly pay you Tuesday for a hamburger today." Of course, everyone knew Wimpy did not intend to pay for that hamburger.

President Clinton is saying, "We will not pay you back in 10 years, but we will stop getting an advance on those, if you will, hamburgers at that time." The President has said that it would be too painful to bring the budget into balance in less than 10 years.

Now, remember Thomas Jefferson, while President, introduced a plan to pay back the Federal debt over 16 years and then start paying off that debt and getting it done with. He thought it prudent not just to balance the budget, but to run up a surplus to pay off the debt and have a little extra in reserve.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to ask about this because if the President is not re-elected, that would mean that the budget that he is proposing will actually not be balanced until 9 years after he leaves office. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. You mean, if everything worked out perfectly for the President and he stayed in the full 8 years that is allowed under law, he still would not have a balanced budget? That is what it means.

Mr. KINGSTON. Then at what level will the national debt be? Because that would be 9 more years of deficit spending on top of a \$4.8 trillion debt. Did he project what the debt would be?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. He did not project. But if the CBO projection, and you really cannot tell whether what he said was a political statement or whether he is serious about balancing the budget, we will not know that until we see the details. But we are looking at a growing budget, and if it is consistent with the spending that he suggested when he gave us his budget in February, that is at least \$200 billion a

year, times 10, times 10 years. We are looking at a budget that cannot possibly be paid back by our kids and our grandkids.

It is going to ruin their chances for a standard of living.

I think it is good to mention; he said it is going to be too painful to pay back this debt in just 7 years, but the pain we are talking about is political pain, admitting reality. So we have a problem here. We are spending money we do not have now. We are asking our kids and our grandkids to pick up that bill years from now, and you just cannot do it.

I think the President has got to come to this table, and if he expects to have any credibility in terms of input in the best way possible to cut spending and balance the budget, then he has got to come to the table seriously.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield further, one thing that is interesting, I usually speak to two or three schools each month. I talk a lot to the high school juniors and seniors, and I always remind them, when they graduate and get in the work world, their percentage of income that goes to taxes is going to be far higher than their teachers, parents, grandparents, or any other generation of Americans that has ever entered the workplace.

We talked about postponing pain. Tell that to an 18- or 19-year-old who is about to get his or her first job. They will tell you, "I cannot believe how much of my paycheck Uncle Sam gets," and, as you know, the third largest expenditure of the national budget now is interest on the debt. Think how much greater it will be if we wait 10 years.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The projection is that these kids today, if we continue to spend like we have been spending, are going to have to pay taxes that amount to over \$180,000 during their lifetime just to pay their share of the interest on the national debt.

You know, this little card is what Congressmen use to vote with. It is sort of like a credit card, but really the Federal Government, these 435 Members of Congress here, do not have money to give away. They have got to take money away from the citizens all across this country, taxpayers, and we are giving away taxpayers' money. The way you hear some people talk, you would think it is government's money that they are giving away. We are taking away this money from individuals by increasing taxes.

I would invite the President to come seriously to the negotiating table, admit that it is right to balance the budget, come legitimately and say, "Yes, I agree, we should be balancing in 5 years, 7 if necessary, and let us get on with making a better future for our kids."

#### COMMEMORATING FLAG DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan may want to complete that thought. I do not want to cut him off. It sounds like he got where he was going with that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield, no, I want to talk about some significance and open the discussion today, Flag Day, and the American flag.

I had a brother that was a jet pilot, killed in 1957. I am old enough that I went through World War II, and the American flag is more than a symbol. It is what many Americans really out there on the front lines fought for and died for.

So I look forward to the gentleman's comments on Flag Day.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is interesting. I went to the Savannah Scottish Rite Flag Day ceremony this week, in Savannah, and we talked about the Bennington flag and the Grand Union flag that preceded our first national flag on June 14, 1777.

That flag has meant so much to different people, but our favorite flag story is the one about Francis Scott Key.

One of the things we always know is he was on a British ship, but we do not know what he was doing there. He was not a captive. His friend was a captive. He went to the British ship voluntarily on behalf of his friend and petitioned the officer in charge to release his friend, who was a doctor, for humanitarian purposes. He said, "This gentleman is a doctor. He needs to come and tend to the sick and the wounded just as your British doctors do." And the British officer in charge was so taken back by his bravery in risking his own life in coming out there, and, you see, there were actually two of them totally. He said, "I will tell you what, I will let all three of you guys go in the morning. We are attacking Fort McHenry through the night." They were, frankly, very confident they could win and capture Fort McHenry.

What happened, of course, is Francis Scott Key and his friends were sitting on the ship, bow of the ship, standing there captives, watching through the night, trying to figure out what would happen, and then at the dawn's early light they were able to determine, of course, by the sign, the American flag still standing or still flying, that the British were, in fact, not successful in taking Fort McHenry.

He started writing the poem, which became the national anthem, on his way back, because the British officer kept his word, let him go, starting writing the poem, finished it later. It took about 130 years for Congress to declare that the national anthem. You compare that to how quickly the Senate works these days, and we would still probably not have a national anthem.

You know, the American flag does two things. It is a warm and fuzzy emotion when you see it. You know, you